

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
TENNESSEE, NASHVILLE DIVISION

Danielle Lynette Wright v. State of Tennessee, et al.

Wright · No. 3:24-cv-00199 · Decided January 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee denied Danielle Lynette Wright’s motion for relief from final judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b). The court concluded that Wright’s allegations of neglect, fraud, misconduct, and racketeering did not satisfy any enumerated ground for relief or demonstrate extraordinary circumstances warranting relief under Rule 60(b)(6).

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, Nashville Division
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, Nashville Division
DECIDED	January 8, 2026
DOCKET	3:24-cv-00199
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60 for relief from the final judgment entered after dismissal of her second amended complaint.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Danielle Lynette Wright v. State of Tennessee, et al.

TOPICS

- motion for reconsideration
- civil procedure
- section 1983
- civil rights
- prisoners rights

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Wright established a basis under one of the enumerated provisions of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) for relief from the final judgment.
2. Whether Wright demonstrated extraordinary circumstances warranting relief under Rule 60(b)(6).

HOLDINGS

1. Wright's assertions of neglect, fraud, misconduct, and alleged racketeering-related conduct did not place her case within any of the enumerated grounds for relief under Rule 60(b).
2. Wright did not demonstrate the extraordinary circumstances necessary for relief under Rule 60(b)(6).

KEY QUOTATIONS

“As a prerequisite to relief under Rule 60(b), a party must establish that the facts of its case are within one of the enumerated reasons contained in Rule 60(b) that warrant relief from judgment.”

“This argument does not place Wright’s case within any of the enumerated provisions of Rule 60(b).”

“Nor has Wright demonstrated any “extraordinary circumstances” that would justify relief under the catch-all provision of Rule 60(b)(6).”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Wright brought a § 1983 action against the State of Tennessee and other defendants, and the court dismissed her second amended complaint before entering final judgment. In her Rule 60 motion, she asserted neglect, fraud, misconduct, and alleged racketeering-related embezzlement and extortion, but the court noted that the second amended complaint did not assert RICO claims.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Wright filed a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. The court dismissed her second amended complaint and entered final judgment; Wright then moved for relief from that judgment under Rule 60(b). The district court denied the motion.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Johnson v. Unknown Dellatifa, 357 F.3d 539, 543 (6th Cir. 2004)
- BLOM Bank SAL v. Honickman, 605 U.S. 204, 213 (2025)

OPINION

Wright

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

NASHVILLE DIVISION

DANIELLE LYNETTE WRIGHT,)

#579080,)) Plaintiff,)) v.) No. 3:24-cv-00199) STATE OF TENNESSEE, et al.,)) Defendants.

)

ORDER

Danielle Wright brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Doc. No. 1). The Court dismissed Wright's second amended complaint and entered final judgment. (Doc. Nos. 25, 26). Wright then filed a Motion for Relief from Judgment, which is now before the Court. (Doc. No. 27) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 60). On motion and just terms, the court may relieve a party or its legal representative from a final judgment, order, or proceeding for the following reasons:

- (1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect;
- (2) newly discovered evidence that, with reasonable diligence, could not have been discovered in time to move for a new trial under Rule 59(b);
- (3) fraud (whether previously called intrinsic or extrinsic), misrepresentation, or misconduct by an opposing party;
- (4) the judgment is void;
- (5) the judgment has been satisfied, released, or discharged; it is based on an earlier judgment that has been reversed or vacated; or applying it prospectively is no longer equitable; or
- (6) any other reason that justifies relief.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). "As a prerequisite to relief under Rule 60(b), a party must establish that the facts of its case are within one of the enumerated reasons contained in Rule 60(b) that warrant relief from judgment." *Johnson v. Unknown Dellatifa*, 357 F.3d 539, 543 (6th Cir. 2004) (quotation marks and citation omitted). Here, Wright requests "relief via express ground on the actual neglect, fraud, misconduct, and the Racketeering Influence Corrupt Organization activities of embezzlement and extortion performed by each defendant respectively as documented in the previous court record."! (Doc. No. 27). This argument does not place Wright's case within any of the enumerated provisions of Rule 60(b). Nor has Wright demonstrated any "extraordinary circumstances" that would justify relief under the catch-all provision of Rule 60(b)(6). *BLOM Bank SAL v. Honickman*, 605 U.S. 204, 213 (2025). Accordingly, Wright's Motion for Relief from Judgment (Doc. No. 27) is DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED. Woub. Eusbe.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

' The second amended complaint did not raise any claims under the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act. (See generally Doc. No. 19).